

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL II

NEW YORK, MARCH 13, 1909

No 19

The Evening Post, for January 23, has an editorial of such unusual consideration for the conditions of classical study that it is here reproduced:

A generation ago the teacher, the text-book and a few benches sufficed for instruction in all departments of most American colleges. With the advent of scientific courses, however, material equipment began to commend itself, and scores even of the smaller colleges are to-day provided with costly scientific laboratories. They should not entail, however, the comparative neglect of other departments. The time is not yet in sight when we can drop that culture which comes from first-hand contact with Greece and Rome, and no college claiming to offer a liberal education should put itself in the attitude of discriminating against them. Yet the failure to provide suitable facilities for classical discipline, in comparison with that which is so generously done for scientific studies, is having the effect, to-day, of such discrimination.

There is a widespread belief among teachers that the narrower textual and linguistic phases of classical study should yield to methods which would awaken a broader and deeper human interest, but to do this successfully requires a more liberal equipment than trustees or donors have so far seen fit to provide, except in a mere dozen of the most richly endowed institutions. The archaeological explorations of the past fifty years have thrown a wonderful light upon ancient life, but there are few colleges and universities in position to offer to students more than a small fraction of the printed reports, casts, models, photographs, lantern slides, etc. The ancient manuscripts of the leading classical authors have been reproduced by photographic processes and published in large folios which do not fail to stimulate the interest of every real student who has the good fortune to see them; but only a handful of American colleges have been liberal enough to provide that stimulus. The scientific instructor usually has a good lantern right at hand, enabling him to throw in a slide or two at any moment, by way of illustration, and pass on with no loss of time. The classical instructor usually has nothing of the kind. The scientific departments almost invariably have their special appropriations for equipment, aside from their allowance from library funds; the Latin and Greek departments almost never. It may be a great compliment to the classical teacher to assume that he can make bricks with so little straw; but the effect on the average student is to convince him that the authorities are not concerned whether that particular brand of brick is made at their kilns at all. The time has certainly come when a "square deal" in the educational field demands a little evening up.

The distinction here remarked has been felt, of course, by classical teachers for a long time, but classical teachers are too often inclined to hopeless-

ness when the question of fair treatment is brought up and consequently the points made in the editorial have not been impressed as they should have been upon the executive officers of our colleges and universities.

The evil is much more serious, however, than The Evening Post imagines. It goes beyond a mere provision of illustrative material and the like. Our scientific brethren were quick to see that to teach science without a laboratory is foolishness, but our classical teachers have had for centuries to do what amounts to the same thing. In the Middle Ages Latin was taught essentially by the laboratory method and nowadays the teachers of modern languages are coming more and more to the belief that the preparation of translation and the like at home, without oversight, involves as great a waste of time as the performance of scientific experiments without oversight would involve. The same is true in classical teaching. It ought to be possible to demand in our colleges as much time for supervising study in Classics as is devoted to laboratory work in science with exactly the same credit. That is to say, if two hours' laboratory work means one hour's credit in the course, two hours' supervised study in Classics should mean the same. This involves a consequence. There should be in the department of Classics provision made for a class of instructors of the same relative rank as laboratory assistants whose duty it should be to supervise the study hours of the classes. I do not mean the preceptorial system as it is practiced at Princeton, though that is a great step in advance, but I mean a system by which a class reading, say, Horace, should prepare under oversight translations of Horatian odes with such assistance only as can be derived from editions and dictionaries, these latter being put upon the same level as laboratory manuals. The subject is an interesting one; I shall return to it.

G. L.

ALCIBIADES

(Concluded from page 140)

We have one play of Euripides—the Troades—remaining to us from the year 415, the year after the Melian horror and of the sailing of the magnificent expedition to Sicily. In the two years between the production of the Andromache and that of the Troades Alcibiades had been following out his restless course,

ever bitterly vindictive against Sparta, ever determined to be the greatest man in Athens and in the Greek world. Alcibiades proposed (according to Plutarch; Thucydides says nothing on this point) the decree by which the whole male population of Melos was put to death. The women and children were sold into slavery. This inhumanity must have oppressed the better Athenians and indeed it long lay upon their national conscience, as Xenophon testifies. Ten years later, when Athens faced the prospect of capitulation to Sparta, through one awful night the words were on the lips of many that they would now suffer what they had done to Melos. With the dramatic instinct Thucydides places his detailed account of this event just before the magnificent departure to Sicily, as though thinking of the Nemesis from Heaven which he never mentions in his history. The expedition to Sicily was Alcibiades's darling scheme. He would conquer Sicily, Italy, and then add Carthage to the Athenian empire. And Thucydides appears to think that he might have done this if it had not been that Athens distrusted him because of the corruption of his private life and so took from him the power she had entrusted to him and gave it to those unequal to the task. The expedition was bitterly opposed by Nicias; yet he was sent upon it with his young opponent, for whom he had a strong dislike.

But let us return to Euripides and the Troades. Wilamowitz finds this play most significant for the psychology of Euripides himself at this time. He calls the play Euripides's renunciation of his country and believes that in all the dramas after the Suppliants there is bitterness of spirit, for which he makes Alcibiades, "that diabolically gifted man", responsible. He regards it as well nigh impossible that Euripides should have had close relations with Alcibiades after the catastrophe of Melos. And Gilbert Murray in his introduction to his translation of that play says "(Euripides) writes under the influence of a year which to him as to Thucydides had been filled full of indignant pity and of dire foreboding. This tragedy is, perhaps, in European literature, the first great expression of the spirit of pity for mankind exalted into a moving principle; a principle which has made the most precious, and possibly the most destructive, elements of innumerable rebellions, revolutions, and martyrdom; and of at least two great religions". According to these two scholars, then, we owe this wonderful tragedy, and, according to Wilamowitz, the bitterness of the poet's subsequent work, to the sinister genius and deed of Alcibiades in the atrocity of Melos.

Euripides has a reference to Alcibiades at the end of his *Electra*, brought out in 413, when the Athenians, after receiving that dignified and pathetic letter from Nicias telling of the Athenian losses in Sicily and his own sickness, sent out as large an armament as before, but with no such splendor and rejoicing,

under Demosthenes, their best general. In Euripides's play, Castor and Polydeuces, the *dei ex machina*, after settling the difficulties of *Electra* and *Orestes*, say that they must go with speed to the Sicilian waters to save the ships at sea; they will not aid the curse-laden, but will set the good and upright man free from his bitter troubles. Here the curse-laden is Alcibiades, who is in a three-fold manner accursed, as an Alcmaeonid, as under accusation for desecration of the mysteries and the mutilation of the Hermes and condemned therefor, and as a traitor instructing his country's enemies. The pious and upright man is Nicias, of whom Thucydides says that he deserved less than anyone he knew to meet the fate he did, because of the goodness of his life.

Alcibiades found Sparta dull after Athens. He could not change his nature and corrupted the wife of King Agis in the absence of the latter. For this he was forced to leave Sparta. He was highly popular with the enemies of Athens now that she was brought so low through him, but Agis worked against him everywhere. He turned to Tissaphernes, the great Persian satrap, and exercised over him that charm which he made all who met him feel. But he wanted to return to Athens—he would not be a man without a country, and he was so true an Athenian that he was happy nowhere else. The eighth book of Thucydides's history is full of his machinations toward this end. After two years of banishment, in 411, that awful year for Athens, he was recalled to the army in Samos at the instance of the patriotic Thrasybulus. There he made a speech to the assembled soldiers, lamenting his exile and the cruelty of those who had driven him from Athens. He had influence and money, and his return to Athens, which had been brought to feel her need of him, as he had declared at Sparta that she would, was clearly prefigured. It is interesting to think of the excitement that prevailed in Athens at the thought of Alcibiades's home-coming. In Aristophanes's later drama of the *Frogs*, at the time of Alcibiades's second exile, we have the following scene:

Dion.—Advise me first of Alcibiades.

Whose birth gives travail still to mother Athens.

Pluto.—What is her disposition toward him?

D.—Well, she loves and hates him and she wants to have him.

E.—Out on the burgher who to serve his state
Is slow, but swift to do her deadly harm
With much wit for himself and none for her.

D.—Good! by Poseidon! and what say you?

Aesch.—No lion's whelp within thy precincts raise.
But if ye rear him, bend ye to his ways!

He commanded the Athenian fleet successfully for three years after his recall to the Athenian army at Samos in 411 and in 408 returned in triumph to Athens and was appointed commander-in-chief. Thu-

cydides's history ends abruptly in the year 411 with the battle of Cynossema, and the promises brought by Alcibiades to the army at Samos of the help of the powerful Tissaphernes, which he had secured for Athens.

Xenophon takes up the tale of Athenian history with a very short, but inexplicable interval.

We turn now to him and to the *Phoenissae* of Euripides for Alcibiades's further fortunes. In Xenophon's first book we learn of his success in fighting a sea-battle for Athens against Sparta at Cyzicus and of his able and strenuous leadership for three years which won back much of their empire for them in the Propontis and its neighborhood. Finally he sailed home to Athens. Xenophon, doubtless an eyewitness of the scene, describes his home-coming thus:

Alcibiades anchored near the shore, but did not leave the ship at once as he feared hostility. He stood on deck and scanned the crowd to see if his friends were there. At the sight of his cousin Euryptolemus and other relatives and friends, he came ashore and went up to the town surrounded by men ready to ward off every blow from him if any one should attack him. He made his defense before the people and before the Senate, denying the charge of impiety and declaring that he had been wronged. No one dared dispute this as the people were in no temper for attacks on him and he was unanimously proclaimed commander-in-chief with unlimited power. And he was believed to be the one to restore the city's lost glory, for he escorted the procession of the mystae to Eleusis with his troops by land. They had been obliged in recent years to go about by sea on account of the Spartan occupation of Decelea. Then he sailed against Andros which had revolted against Athens. After defeating the Andrians he set up a trophy and then sailed to Samos to take charge of the war.

He was never again to see the Athens which welcomed him back with such rejoicing and heaped her honors on him. The next year, because of an unsuccessful sea-fight with Sparta at which he was not present, as Xenophon tells us, the Athenians changed utterly toward him; ascribing their defeat to his carelessness, they deposed him and elected ten new generals, among them those ill-fated generals who were to meet their death at the hands of the enraged democracy after winning the victory of Arginusae.

This change towards Alcibiades, who was really now the hope of the democracy which had idolized him, is all of a piece with the other irresponsible acts of the Athenian people in the closing years of the Peloponnesian War. They were then singularly bereft of great men, without leader, or worse, led by such men as the blustering Cleophon, who is described by Euripides in the *Orestes* as a demagogue of Thracian origin, strong in his impudence, a Greek but no Greek, one who had forced his way by his bluster and his unbridled ignorant tongue, gifted with some eloquence to the ruin of his adopted country.

It is significant that Aristophanes in the play of 406 in which he bitterly attacks Cleophon and his like

makes Aeschylus advise Athens to bring home their lion's cub and honor him. And Thucydides says of him that although his talents as a military commander were unrivalled the Athenians entrusted the administration to others because they personally objected to the lawlessness of his private life and so they speedily shipwrecked their state.

Alcibiades, as Xenophon tells us, now in disrepute, left the army and retired to a castle in the Thracian Chersonesus, which he had earlier prepared as a refuge for himself if need should come. In this his second exile he did not try to injure Athens. On the contrary, when he saw from his castle walls the Athenian fleet at Aegospotami falling into the trap laid by Sparta and anchoring at a place where they were doomed to destruction, he came down to them and told them to go to Sestos, where, he said, "you will have the advantage of position and can choose your own time to fight". But the generals bade him go away, saying that *they* were now generals, not he, and he went back to his castle. At Athens there was still a feeling that he could help them, as the play of Aristophanes of the year 406 shows, with its advice to indulge their lion's cub now that he is grown to years of strength, and Theramenes in his speech of 404 before Critias, as given by Xenophon, expressly disclaims approval of the second exile of Alcibiades.

Euripides, too, softened toward him in the year of his home-coming. In the *Phoenissae*, brought out at the time the question of his return was mooted, he represents a dialogue between Jocasta, wife of Oedipus, and her son Polynices, the ill-treated younger brother, in which the sorrows of exile are dwelt on by Polynices in a way to suggest Alcibiades at once. It would take too long to point out the coincidences in detail. One however is so Athenian that I must speak of it. Polynices says that the greatest sorrow of his exile has been that he must put up with the *ἀμαθία*—lack of cultivation—of those among whom he was forced to stay while banished. And his mother condoles with him, saying it must be hard indeed *συμμορφεῖν τοῖς μὴ σοφοῖς* to share the lack of cultivation of the uncultivated. This is a thrust at Spartan *ἀμαθία* and rudeness, which Alcibiades adopted from motives of policy, as Plutarch says, unpleasant as he found the enforced society of the Spartans, longing as he did for Athens.

These words of Euripides also have Alcibiades in mind:

"Mother, wise and yet a fool was I when I went among our enemies,

But love of native land constrains us all. Who disputes this cloaks his thought with idle words; his heart is there". Compare the speech of Alcibiades in the seventh book of Thucydides:

"The true enemies of Athens are those who have compelled me to become her enemy. The country I am attacking is no longer mine, but a lost country I

am seeking to regain. The true patriot is not he who when unjustly exiled abstains from attacking his country, but he who in the warmth of his affection for her seeks to regain her without regard to means". The case of Polynices against Thebes is made by Euripides a strong and sympathetic parallel for this.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

VASSAR COLLEGE

PROFESSOR ASHMORE'S REPLY¹

In reference to what Professor Fairclough has said about my edition of the Comedies of Terence, I would ask the readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to suspend judgment until they have taken into account the following considerations:

Professor Fairclough directs the larger part of his attack against Tyrrell's text, which I have adopted (see my preface), and for which accordingly I am sponsor. In corroboration of his denunciation of that text he cites what he calls a "searching review" of it by Paul Wessner, which appeared some time ago in the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift (Volume 23). Mr. Fairclough takes it for granted that all the world must accept Wessner's verdict, whereas most of the world has learned, in the last quarter of a century, that German scholarship is not infallible, and that in dealing with anything of British origin it is almost invariably prejudiced.

In seeking to prove the "searching" character of Wessner's review Mr. Fairclough cites three verses in which an unnecessary ictus is printed. The ictus was printed once on certain words in these verses, in accordance with the theory then held of their scansion; later, transpositions were made, and yet, though the words involved no longer carried an ictus, the ictus, by bad proof-reading, was allowed to stand. Here, surely, we have no question of text-criticism or of scholarship, but mere typographical blunders, reprehensible, yes, but no proof of the inferiority of the text in which they occur or of the unsoundness of the critical principles of the editor, whose eyes were not keen enough to detect and remove them.

In reference to Tyrrell's alleged "weakness" for *equidem*, the reader is referred to the last page of Tyrrell's preface, where Tyrrell justifies his "weakness" on the ground that the form *equidem* (as opposed to *quidem*) is really the true form of the word, which he (Tyrrell) has restored, and on the further ground that the copyists were not aware that it could be used with the second and third persons. That it was so used by Plautus, Sallust and other ancients, we have only to consult Harper's Latin Lexicon for proof; see also Reisig-Haase Vorlesungen, 1. 392. On the same page of his preface Tyrrell refers to the admission into his text

of such forms as *ist*, *rest* and *reapse*, and implies that they are admitted for the meter's sake. At any rate, there is plenty of analogy for *ist* and *rest*, while *reapse* is easily accounted for. "Yet our editor makes no comment", says Mr. Fairclough. But I explain that *ist* = *is est*, and that *rest* = *res est* (see notes on Andr. 906 and 459), and that *reapse* is equivalent to *re* + *eapse* (old form = *ipsa*): see note on Hec. 778.

Mr. Fairclough would lead the reader to suppose that, because I sometimes express dissent from Tyrrell's readings (a thing which I hold to be quite proper; never before have I seen it implied that independence of judgment is reprehensible), there is "not seldom inconsistency between text and commentary" in my book. I can only say in reply to this, that nowhere in the book is there any "inconsistency between text and commentary". The commentary everywhere relates to the text as the latter stands in the book, and not to any other text; the lemma of my notes is always a word or words actually seen in my text. Mr. Fairclough is confused; I do frequently, so he says, express a preference for readings other than Tyrrell's; but, I repeat, lemmata and text agree always. Even on Andr. 536, where Mr. Fairclough tries hard to make it appear that my note deals with *pauca* only, while my text reads *pauis*, my note actually discusses *pauis* (of the text) before it mentions *pauca*, and though the note may seem to defend *pauca*, yet the note's logical application to the text is clear. Nor does Mr. Fairclough give the exact truth in saying that at Andr. 288 I leave a footnote (of Tyrrell's) "which is now (i. e. after my modification of Tyrrell's scansion) inconsistent with the text"; for I have made an addition (in brackets) to the footnote, which addition rectifies any possible inconsistency, and, what is more, I have explained the whole difficulty in the commentary—all of which Mr. Fairclough ignores.

Mr. Fairclough takes me to task for omitting to alter Tyrrell's footnote on Ph. 370—a footnote which, as he expresses it, "must make most scholars either blush or smile". But Tyrrell's footnote is merely an independent expression of preference for a certain scansion which Tyrrell himself does not adopt. Therefore it does not affect the text and does not need to be expunged. Moreover, so good a scholar as A. Palmer did not "blush" to sanction a like scansion in Plaut. Am. 3. 2. 50 (930), and he had the German scholar Spengel as his authority.

Again it may be, that to some minds the omission from the Introduction of a conspectus metrorum and of a summary of Terentian linguistic peculiarities is as serious a matter as Mr. Fairclough would have it appear. To my mind, however, the consequent gain in space is full justification for the omission complained of. But Mr. Fairclough misrepres-

¹ For Professor Fairclough's review of Professor Ashmore's Terence, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2. 140-143.

sents me when he assumes (and it is pure assumption) that I refer the student to the 'Einleitung' prefixed to the Dziatzko-Haule edition of the *Phormio* as though this were an adequate substitute for the summary in question. My words, which follow those quoted by Professor Fairclough (see my preface, p. vii), namely, "but the student will do well to consult the admirable 'Einleitung', etc.", prove that I do not regard it as adequate. Moreover, I do not believe that with such a summary given in the Introduction I could have "dispensed with many notes and unnecessary repetitions". Summary or no summary, it is a fact that constant reference to the sections of an introduction can never take the place of explanatory notes presented in their own proper place, and it is also a fact that frequent repetitions in the commentary of a book like the one before us are not only desirable but exceedingly important. Such repetitions are all too few in the present volume, while those that do appear are due to a desire to make the book easily and immediately useful, whatever the play by which the student is introduced to Terence.

Mr. Fairclough has an interesting way (already apparent) of holding back a part of my statement, when to quote the whole of it would tell against the point he is making against me. For example, he finds that my acceptance of the year 190 (this year is now more commonly believed to be the right one than the year 185; see footnote, Introduction, p. 26) as the birth-year of Terence does not tally with my subsequent statement (Introduction, p. 29) that "the poet's stylistic qualities appear to be most miraculous in view of his immature years and foreign extraction", but in quoting me Mr. Fairclough omits the words "and foreign extraction". These words are exceedingly important to my point, though, of course, they are exceedingly detrimental to his. But even if the year 190 be accepted as that of Terence's birth, Terence would have been only thirty-one years old when he died (and only twenty-five years old when he wrote the *Andria*). It is certainly not inappropriate to speak of the immature years of a literary man of thirty-one (not to mention twenty-five), particularly when we remember how late in life Roman men matured (consider the well-known story of Caesar and Alexander in Suetonius, Jul. 7).

How Mr. Fairclough can say that I make no reference to so important an authority as Klotz (*Grundzüge Altromische Metrik*) I do not see. Possibly he refers only to my Introduction. If so I am in good company, for Mr. Fairclough himself omits all reference to that authority from his own Introduction to the *Andria*. True, he refers to Klotz in his Appendix, but I also do the same in mine; see my Appendix on Ph. 901.

Again, the difference in the scansion between the specimen of Saturnian verse on p. 12 of my In-

troduction and the epitaph of Naevius on p. 17 of the same is fully accounted for by references in footnotes on both of those pages, one of the references being to Mr. Fairclough's own edition of the *Andria*, p. xxv, n. 2. Yet he complains that "no explanation (of the difference) is given" in my book.

Mr. Fairclough says that I accept certain scansion "which are now generally discarded". His list is given in his article. One of them is *dicerē* (*Andr.* 23), the only one selected from the *Andria*. Yet this one Mr. Fairclough himself accepts in his edition of the *Andria* and makes no comment, although Fleckeisen inserts *ut* into his text, evidently in order to get rid of the final long *e*. But as a matter of fact these scansion have not been "generally discarded". The editors of the *Classical Review* did not hesitate to print Professor Hodgman's papers on noun-declension in Plautus and adjectival forms in Plautus (*Class. Rev.* for 1902, July and December), in which Professor Hodgman records repeated instances of these very scansion. In these days, when the quantitative theory of Saturnian verse is again warmly advocated (see Leo, *Der Saturnische Vers*, as reviewed by Professor Abbott in *Classical Philology*, 2. No. 4), and when Skutsch's "brilliant demonstration" (Lindsay) that final *e* was often disregarded in Plautine scansion is being vigorously challenged by so keen a student of Plautine meters as Professor Radford, it behooves all critics to pause and consider before they count too many things as certainties. As to Mr. Fairclough's method of dealing with my statement regarding the elision of certain final consonants, I refer the reader to Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 225 ff.

In the remarks on the Terentian codices given in his next paragraph Mr. Fairclough harps upon my alleged disloyalty to γ, occasioned by my adherence to Tyrrell (who gives the preference to the δ group of Mss.). But the differences between γ and δ cited by Fairclough (all from the *Andria*!!) are so trivial that I should hardly have been justified in taking note of them, even if I had been as willing to slight Tyrrell's readings as Professor Fairclough professes to be. My critical note on *Andr.* 849 gives the best of reasons why I am "ready to reject a good (?) reading given by all Mss.". Is a consensus of the Mss. never to be gainsaid? Professor Fairclough knows better.

Of course "Weissner" (p. 66) is a misprint for Wessner, and our critic has made the most of it. But the name has not been misspelled where it occurs elsewhere in the book, and the error here was long ago corrected in the plates. But I am indebted to Professor Fairclough for calling my attention to the following misprint (p. 64), which might be misleading: the phrase, "the fifteenth century", has been printed in two successive lines. In the second line where it applies to Euphrasius the word "fifth"

(or "sixth") should take the place of the word "fifteenth"; see my article on Terence in Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, as the typographical errors occurring in Professor Fairclough's recent edition of Vergil, and alluded to (with deference) by Professor Carroll in his review of that book, clearly show: see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 2. 69. Moreover, I think I have shown that Professor Fairclough has "nodded" also in the course of his review of my book—a far less lengthy and sleep-compelling task than that of the proof-readers of Ashmore's Terence.

But the space allowed me for this reply is limited. Professor Fairclough has discovered now that I am unkind to Eugraphius as well as to Wagner and Parry, and again cautions me against throwing stones. He is determined to have me lacking in due appreciation of the Roman grammarians, yet in quoting me to this end he should not have held back a part of what I say. But then that is his way, as I have already pointed out.

It is a little odd, if not also significant, that, whether Professor Fairclough is talking about my text or my commentary, he seems to find it hard to get away from the Andria. In consequence the larger part of my book is still without the benefit of his "searching" criticism. At Andria, 213-214, his criticism is based on his own note (see his edition of that play). But he is careful not to call attention to what my note offers to the student in lieu of that which is contained in his. Again at Andr. 304 I think I have established my point in reference to *cura confectus*. I think also that Mr. Fairclough's quotations from Ennius and Cicero tend to confirm what I have said rather than what he says. On Andr. 305 the derivation I give of *edepol* is regarded as *probable* by Walde, Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (1905), a book highly rated by competent critics. In my note on Andr. 328 I give my reasons for preferring *hacc* to *haec*. Terence had already become one of the *veteres* when Cicero wrote. On Andr. 439 Mr. Fairclough quotes only a part of my note and then says that it "will hardly hold", whereas in that very note I refer the student to his edition of the Andria, in which the "well-known rule" as to the use of *huiusce* is given in full. Any student, therefore, who is of opinion that such rules have no exceptions may easily fall back on Mr. Fairclough's teachings and discard mine. In Andr. 483 the "interesting reading *istam*" hangs on a slender thread—so much so that to discuss it, except in a special edition of the Andria, seems hardly worth while. Wessner is not convinced that Donatus "knew it", nor does the word occur in the Bembiné Scholia, but only something like it. Moreover, Mr. Fairclough, in bringing it into his text (instead of *ista*) against the testimony of the 7

Mss., does violence to that very allegiance which he would force others to respect.

The space allowed me is not sufficient for a full discussion of Mr. Fairclough's remarks, nor, indeed, for more than a very meager response to his criticisms. I am not of the opinion that my book is faultless, but I do think that Professor Fairclough has failed to show either that the text is "faulty" in any real or technical sense of the word, or that the book contains "numerous errors in details", or that there is any necessity to use my edition "with caution". *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*, says Tacitus, very truly, and his words have a peculiar significance, as applied to the dubious phraseology employed by Professor Fairclough in the present "review"; for that gentleman has gone out of his way to misquote me, to give a false color to my statements, and generally to mislead the uninitiated. His remarks reflect a determined effort toward a microscopic search for pin-head faults and a manifest avoidance of all search for anything good in the book. Were it not for the animus thus displayed, his "review" would be welcomed by the editor, as every review should be that is intended to bring into relief such errors as are genuine, and of veritable importance to the student.

Schenectady, New York

S. G. ASHMORE

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The twenty-sixth luncheon of the New York Latin Club took place at the Hotel Marlborough on Saturday, February 27. After the luncheon the guest of the Club, Professor John C. Kirtland, of Phillips Exeter Academy, set forth some of the observations he had made in a recent trip of examination to the English schools. The paper will be published in a subsequent issue of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, but it is important to remark here that Professor Kirtland showed clearly the great elasticity of the English system of Latin instruction as compared with our inelastic Caesar, Cicero and Vergil curriculum. This is an important difference and may go far to explain the machine-like kind of instruction that deadens so much of our Latin teaching.

The President reported that the committee on the subject of Greek, appointed last spring, had had a conference with Dr. Stevens, Associate Superintendent of Schools for New York City, and had been assured of the cordial good-will of the educational administration to Greek and their willingness to support it to the limit of their resources, but did not get much satisfaction in definite promises.

The Treasurer reported that the scholarship fund was completed, having reached nearly \$5,200, that this was invested in such a way that an income of \$250 a year was assured. The Club, therefore, voted that the executive committee be directed to frame

conditions for the award of the scholarship and announce such an award for this coming June if, in its judgment, the conditions warranted.

The next regular meeting will take place on May 22; the speaker will be Professor Samuel Ball Platner, of Western Reserve University.

PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES

As fragments of papyri from Egypt become more numerous the task of collocation is increasingly involved. Of Euripides over twenty fragments have been found and published by various authorities, but, so far as is known, no complete list of them is accessible. In Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, 6, Part 1 (1907), pp. 1250-1251, in the article Euripides, there is a list of eighteen such papyri, arranged for the most part chronologically. The following is an alphabetic arrangement of these with certain additional fragments which, it is believed, make the list complete up to date:

- *1. Alceestis (Andromache, Bacchae, Helena), closing chorus. 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 113.
2. Andromache, 5-48. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 101, No. 449.
3. Antiope. 3d century B. C. Hermathena, 3. 38.
4. Archelaus. 2d or 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 65, No. 419.
5. Electra, Hypothesis. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 66, No. 420.
6. Hippolytus, 242-459. Before the 6th century A. D. Mon. Ber. Akad. (Berlin, 1881), 982 ff.
- *7. Hypsipyle. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 6 (1908).
8. Iro (?). Ptolemaic period. Cunningham Mem. 9 (1893), No. 49 d.
- *9. Iphigenia among the Taurians, 174-191, 245-285, 581-595, 600-629. 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 108.
10. Medea, 5-12. 2d century B. C. Un Papyrus Inédit, H. Weil, 16.
11. Medea, 710-715. 3d century A. D. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 3. 103, No. 450.
12. Melanippe (Desmotis?). 3d century A. D. Greek Papyri, Series II. New Classical Fragments, 24.
13. Melanippe Desmotis. 4th or 5th century A. D. Zeitschr. für Äg. Sprache und Alt., 1880, 37 ff.
- *14. Oeneus (?). 3d century B. C. Hibeh Papyri, 1. 21.
15. Orestes, 338-352. Augustan age. Mitt. P. Rainer, 5 (1892), 65.
16. Orestes, 1062-1090. 2d or 3d century A. D. Revue de Philologie, 19. 105.

*These fragments are not given in Pauly-Wissowa.

17. Phoenissae, 1017-1043, 1064-1071. 3d century A. D. (?). Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 2. 114, No. 224.
18. Phoenissae, 1097-1107, 1126-1137. 4th or 5th century A. D. Mitt. P. Rainer, 5 (1892), 74 ff.
- (19. Rhesus, 48-96. 4th or 5th century A. D. S. Ber. Akad., 1887, pt. 2, 813 ff.).
20. Sciron. 6th or 7th century A. D. Amherst Papyri (Greek), 2. 8, No. 17.
21. Fragmentum de dialectica, containing quotations from eight tragedies. 2d century B. C. Not. et Extr. des Manuscrits, Bibl. Nat., Paris, 18, pt. 2.
22. Fragment (probably not Euripidean). 2d century B. C. Un Papyrus Inédit, H. Weil, 2. Cf. Wilamowitz, Herakles, 1. 41.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

L. C. SPAULDING

AN ANCIENT VIEW OF DESTRUCTIVE NATURAL PHENOMENA

The editorial in *The Nation* of February 4, "Earthquakes Then and Now", suggests the appropriateness of a reference to the discussions prevalent among Greek and Roman writers as to the question whether lightning was Jove's bolt of wrath or merely a natural force. Epicureans, Academicians, and perhaps also Cynics, with arguments probably derived from Pericles's friend Anaxagoras, were united in their attacks upon the Stoics, who defended the popular religious belief. Out of this controversy emerged a view with a decidedly modern ring. In Seneca's *Naturales Questiones*, ii. 46, we read: At quare Iuppiter aut ferienda transit aut innoxia ferit? To which the answer is given:

Sic omnia esse disposita, ut etiam quae ab illo non flunt, tamen sine ratione non fiant, quae illius est. Nam etiamsi Iuppiter illa non facit nunc, Iuppiter fecit ut fierent. Singulis non adest, et tamen vim et causam et manum omnibus dedit.

HERMAN L. ERELING

HAMILTON COLLEGE, CLINTON, N. Y.

(Reprinted from *The Nation*.)

G. E. Stechert & Co. have brought out the second edition of the English translation of Hülsen's *Das Forum Romanum* (for a review of the first edition of the translation see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 1. 20). The present translation takes due account of the literature of the Forum for the three years that have elapsed since the appearance of the first edition. The number of illustrations has been increased from 139 to 151, and in other cases cuts have been revised and corrected. It is a pleasure to find this important work kept so thoroughly abreast of the investigations in the Forum.

The CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

MITCHELL CARROLL, The George Washington University

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

VERGIL'S AENEID

by Charles Knapp, Ph.D., Barnard College, Columbia University

A prominent high school teacher writes us:

"I have submitted to my class six editions of Vergil and asked them to look every one over carefully. After doing this each member of the class was to hand me a slip of paper with the names of the different editions in the order of excellence, in the opinion of the person handing in the paper. Thus far, about one-third of the thirty-five members of the class have handed in the ballots. As I expected, KNAPP'S VERGIL leads the list on EVERY ONE."

Half leather, dark green. Twelve full-page halftones, map and small cuts. Separate text for classroom. \$1.40.

Send for descriptive circular

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY, Publishers
378-388 Wabash Avenue, Chicago

ROEHR PUBLISHING CO. PRINTERS

35 Myrtle Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Printers of "The Classical Weekly"

Caesar's Gallic War

By W. B. Gannison & W. H. Harley, Examiners, Hall High School

All the text, grammar and composition needed for second year work; convenient, practical, economical. \$1.25.

THE FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

By the same authors; a preparation for Caesar. \$1.00

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO

Pearson's Essentials of Latin, 90 Cents

By HENRY CARR PEARSON

of the Horace Mann School, New York City

"The whole book, in its simplicity and clearness, is one which the average pupil can readily master."—*Classical Weekly*, Feb. 15, 1908.

Published by

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

100 Washington Square : : : New York City

D'OOGEE'S LATIN COMPOSITION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Part I is based on Caesar's "Gallic War."

Part II on Cicero's "Manilian Law," "Catiline" I-IV, and the "Archias."

Part III contains 34 miscellaneous exercises based on Cicero.

A clear, logical and well-proportioned course in Latin Composition for the second, third and fourth years in secondary schools which thoroughly familiarizes the student with the style, idioms and vocabulary of Caesar and Cicero.

GINN & COMPANY, Publishers

70 Fifth Avenue, New York

Gildersleeve-Lodge LATIN SERIES

Barss' Beginning Latin	\$1.00
Barss' Writing Latin—Book I50
Barss' Writing Latin—Book II75
Dotey's Exercise Books on Caesar, each25
Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Grammar	1.20
Moulton's Introductory Latin	1.00
Perrin's Caesar's Civil War	1.00
Sallust's Catiline	1.00
Towle & Jenks' Caesar	1.25
Tunstall's Cicero	1.20

And 20 other Latin books

D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS, Horace Mann School, Teachers College. 12 mo. Cloth. xiii + 463 pages. \$1.00 net.

This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

Virgil Aeneid Books I-VI

By H. R. FAIRCLOUGH, Professor of Latin, Leland Stanford Junior University, and SELDON L. BROWN, Principal of Wellesley Mass. High School. pp. lxi + 515 + 140 1908.

Read the review of this book in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of Dec. 12, 1908.

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.

Boston New York Chicago London